

A2

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of privacy

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
425 Eye Street N.W.
BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F
Washington, D.C. 20536

FILE:

Office: Miami

Date:

MAY 16 2003

IN RE: Applicant:

APPLICATION: Application for Permanent Residence Pursuant to Section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act of November 2, 1966 (P.L. 89-732)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Acting District Director, Miami, Florida, who certified his decision to the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for review. The acting district director's decision will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Colombia who filed this application for adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident under section 1 of the Cuban Adjustment Act (CAA) of November 2, 1966. This Act provides, in pertinent part:

[T]he status of any alien who is a native or citizen of Cuba and who has been inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959 and has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, may be adjusted by the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien makes an application for such adjustment, and the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to the spouse and child of any alien described in this subsection, regardless of their citizenship and place of birth, who are residing with such alien in the United States.

The acting district director determined that the applicant did not qualify for adjustment of status as the spouse of a lawful permanent resident who adjusted under section 1 of the Act. The acting district director, therefore, denied the application.

The applicant appealed the acting district director's notice of certification. She states that she and her son have both been petitioned by her husband who, at the time, did not know he had been denied adjustment; however, he is currently reapplying for CAA with new evidence. The applicant asserts that her husband's last arrest occurred prior to their marriage, he helped her bring up her son, he has been an excellent man while with her, and that she has made a change in her husband's life. She, therefore, requests reconsideration of her application.

The record reflects that on July 3, 1995, at Coral Gables, Florida, the applicant married [REDACTED] a native and citizen of Cuba. Based on that marriage, on October 8, 1998, the applicant filed for adjustment of status under section 1 of the CAA.

The Board, in *Matter of Quijada-Coto*, 13 I&N Dec. 740 (BIA 1971), held that adjustment of status to that of a permanent resident, pursuant to the provisions of the Act of November 2, 1966, is not available to the spouse of an alien described in section 1 of the

Act, where the alien himself had been denied adjustment of status under the Act.

The acting district director, in this case, denied the application after determining that the applicant's Cuban spouse, Mr. [REDACTED] was denied permanent residence under section 1 of the CAA, on June 16, 2000, based on his criminal convictions. On March 15, 2001, the AAO determined that based on Mr. [REDACTED] convictions of crimes involving moral turpitude, he was inadmissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Act. He, therefore, affirmed the district director's decision to deny Mr. [REDACTED] application.

Accordingly, the applicant is ineligible for adjustment of status to permanent residence, pursuant to section 1 of the Act of November 2, 1966. The decision of the acting district director to deny the application will be affirmed.

ORDER: The acting district director's decision is affirmed.